arXiv:1603.04044v1 [math.CO] 13 Mar 2016

On MAXCUT in strictly supercritical random graphs, and coloring of random graphs and random tournaments

Lior Gishboliner * Michael Krivelevich † Gal Kronenberg ‡

March 15, 2016

Abstract

We use a theorem by Ding, Lubetzky and Peres describing the structure of the giant component of random graphs in the strictly supercritical regime, in order to determine the typical size of MAXCUT of $G \sim G\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$ in terms of ε. We then apply this result to prove the following conjecture by Frieze and Pegden. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists ℓ_ε such that w.h.p. $G \sim G(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n})$ is not homomorphic to the cycle on $2\ell_\varepsilon + 1$ vertices. We also consider the coloring properties of biased random tournaments. A p-random tournament on n vertices is obtained from the transitive tournament by reversing each edge independently with probability p. We show that for $p = \Theta(\frac{1}{n})$ the chromatic number of a p-random tournament behaves similarly to that of a random graph with the same edge probability. To treat the case $p = \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}$ we use the aforementioned result on MAXCUT.

1 Introduction

Given a graph G, a *bipartition* of G is a partition of $V(G)$ into two sets, $V(G) = V_1 \uplus V_2$. The *cut* of the partition (V_1, V_2) is the set of edges with one end-point in each V_i. The MAXCUT problem asks to find the size of a largest cut in G. We denote this number by MAXCUT(G). The problem of finding MAXCUT(G) has been extensively studied. It is known to be very important in both combinatorics and theoretical computer science, and has some connections to physics. The MAXCUT problem is known to be NP-hard (see [24, 33]) and even not approximable to within a factor of $\frac{16}{17}$ unless $P = NP$ (see [26]). On the other hand, as shown by Goemans and Williamson [25], there is a semidefinite programming algorithm that approximates MAXCUT to a factor of 0.87856. Moreover, for dense graphs there are polynomial time approximation schemes for MAXCUT(G), which approximate it up to an additive factor of $o(n^2)$, as shown by Arora, Karger and Karpinski in [4], and by Frieze and Kannan in [21].

One natural generalization of the MAXCUT problem is the MAX k-CUT problem that asks an analogous question about k-partitions of a graph. A k-partition of G is a partition of $V(G)$ into k

*School of Mathematical Sciences, Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 6997801, Israel. Email: liorgis1@post.tau.ac.il. Research supported in part by ISF Grant 224/11 and ERC-starting Grant 633509.

†School of Mathematical Sciences, Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 6997801, Israel. Email: krivelev@post.tau.ac.il. Research supported in part by USA-Israel BSF Grant 2014361 and by grant 912/12 from the Israel Science Foundation.

‡School of Mathematical Sciences, Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 6997801, Israel. Email: galkrone@mail.tau.ac.il.

sets, $V(G) = V_1 \uplus \cdots \uplus V_k$. The k-cut of the partition $(V_1, \ldots, V_k)$ is the set of edges connecting vertices in different parts. The MAX k-CUT problem asks to find the size of a largest k-cut in G. Extending the methods of [25], Frieze and Jerrum found in [20] an algorithm that approximates MAX k-CUT up to a known constant factor $\alpha_k < 1$.

For any graph $G = (V, E)$, finding MAXCUT(G) is clearly equivalent to finding the maximal number of edges in a bipartite subgraph of G. The *distance of G from bipartiteness* is defined to be the minimal number of edges whose removal turns G into a bipartite graph. We denote the distance by $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}(G)$. Obviously, $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}(G) = |E| - \mathrm{MAXCUT}(G)$. So asking for the size of a maximum cut in G is equivalent to asking for the distance of G from bipartiteness. In general, it is often convenient to consider the *fraction* of edges that need to be removed in order to make G satisfy some graph property (in our case bipartiteness). We say that a graph G on n vertices is δ-far from satisfying a graph property $\mathcal{P}$ if its distance from $\mathcal{P}$ is at least $\delta|E(G)|$. Otherwise, we say that G is δ-close to $\mathcal{P}$.

In this paper we consider the maximum cut in a random graph. We work in the binomial random graph model $G(n, p)$. This is the probability space that consists of all graphs with n labeled vertices, where each one of the $\binom{n}{2}$ possible edges is chosen independently with probability p. The study of the typical value of MAXCUT in the model $G(n, p)$ has a long history. For starters, if p is not too small, say $p \gg n^{-1/2} \log n$, then one can check (using simple probabilistic tools) that the size of the MAXCUT of a typical $G \sim G(n, p)$ is $\frac{n^2 p}{4}(1 + o(1))$. The problem is more interesting for smaller p, specifically $p = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$. It was shown in [17] that a random graph $G(n, p)$ with $p = \frac{c}{n}$ (for a large enough constant c), does not have a cut with significantly more than half the edges. In 2010, Bayati, Gamarnik and Tetali ([5]) proved that for any $c > 0$, the random variable $n^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{MAXCUT}\left(G\left(n, \frac{c}{n}\right)\right)$ converges in probability to a single value $MC(c)$ (as n tends to infinity). They also established a similar result for the random regular graph model $G_{n,r}$. Asymptotic bounds on $MC(c)$ were obtained by Coppersmith et al. (see [10]), Gamarnik and Li (see [23]) and Feige and Ofek (see [18]). All these bounds are of the form $\frac{c}{4} + \alpha\sqrt{c} + o(\sqrt{c}) \leq MC(c) \leq \frac{c}{4} + \beta\sqrt{c} + o(\sqrt{c})$, where α, β are known absolute constants and the little-o notation is with respect to c. Recently, Dembo, Montanari and Sen found the correct asymptotic behavior of $MC(c)$ up to an error of $o(\sqrt{c})$; they proved that $MC(c) = \frac{c}{4} + \gamma\sqrt{\frac{c}{4}} + o(\sqrt{c})$, where $\gamma \approx 0.7632$. They also obtained a similar result for random regular graphs (see [13]).

The above results cover the case when c is large. We, however, focus on the range around the phase transition value $p = \frac{1}{n}$. It is known that the typical structure of $G(n, p)$ changes significantly as p increases above this value; the giant component appears together with other graph properties. MAXCUT also has a phase transition at $p = \frac{1}{n}$. For $G \sim G\left(n, \frac{c}{n}\right)$, the value of $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}(G) = |E(G)| - \mathrm{MAXCUT}(G)$ is $O(1)$ in expectation if $c < 1$, and typically $\Omega(n)$ if $c > 1$. Indeed, if $c < 1$ then w.h.p. every connected component in $G \sim G\left(n, \frac{c}{n}\right)$ is either a tree or unicyclic, and the number of unicyclic components has a Poisson limiting distribution with an expected value of $O(1)$ (see section 5.4 in [8]). This means that in expectation, the distance of G from bipartiteness, which is at most the number of cycles, is $O(1)$. For $c > 1$, a typical $G \sim G\left(n, \frac{c}{n}\right)$ contains a complex giant connected component whose 2-core is of linear size in n (see section 5.4 in [27]).

The above results on $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}\left(G\left(n, \frac{c}{n}\right)\right)$ were proved by Coppersmith, Gamarnik, Hajiaghayi and Sorkin (see [10]), who showed that if $p = \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}$ for a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, then a typical $G \sim G(n, p)$ is δ-far from being bipartite for $\delta = O\left(\frac{\varepsilon^3}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$. They also conjectured that their result can be improved to $\delta = \Theta(\varepsilon^3)$. Moreover, they showed that the expectation of $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}(G)$ is $O(\varepsilon^3)n$. We prove that

this conjecture is indeed true.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, then $G \sim G\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$ is w.h.p. δ-far from being bipartite for $\delta = \Theta(\varepsilon^3)$.*

The regime $p = \frac{c}{n}$ for $c > 1$, which is considered in this paper, is called the *strictly supercritical regime*. We note that the problem of finding the typical distance to bipartiteness has also been considered in the following regimes: the strictly subcritical regime $p = \frac{c}{n}$ for $c < 1$; the subcritical regime $p = \frac{1-\mu}{n}$ for $n^{-1/3} \ll \mu \ll 1$; the scaling window $p = \frac{1\pm\mu}{n}$ for $\mu = \Theta\left(n^{-1/3}\right)$; the supercritical regime $p = \frac{1+\mu}{n}$ for $n^{-1/3} \ll \mu \ll 1$. For all these regimes, Daudé, Martínez, Rasendrahasina and Ravelomanana found the limit distribution of a normalization of $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}(G)$ (see [12] for the details). For the subcritical regime and the scaling window, Scott and Sorkin [32] showed that a maximum cut of a random graph can be found in linear expected time by a simple algorithm.

We note that the MAX k-CUT problem was also studied in several models of random graphs, such as $G(n,p)$, $G(n,m)$, and the random regular graph model $G_{n,r}$ (see, [7, 10, 11, 28]).

The key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the characterization of the giant component of random graphs in the strictly supercritical regime, obtained by Ding, Lubetzky and Peres in [15].

We use Theorem 1.1 to address two supposedly unrelated problems. The first problem is related to the chromatic number of random graphs and homomorphisms of random graphs. We first give relevant definitions for general graphs. A graph G is called k-colorable if there exists a coloring $c : V(G) \to [k] = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that if $v \sim u$ then $c(v) \neq c(u)$. The *chromatic number* of a graph G, denoted by $\chi(G)$, is the minimal k for which G is k-colorable. A *graph homomorphism* φ from a graph $G = (V, E)$ to a graph $G' = (V', E')$, is a (not necessarily injective) mapping $\varphi : V \to V'$ from the vertex set of G to the vertex set of G' such that if $\{v, u\} \in E(G)$ then $\{\varphi(v), \varphi(u)\} \in E(G')$. We simply denote this mapping by $\varphi : G \to G'$. By the definition, we can see that a graph G is k-colorable if and only if there exists a homomorphism $\varphi : G \to K_k$, where K_k is the complete graph on k vertices. For a graph G and an integer $\ell \geq 1$, a homomorphism $\varphi : G \to C_{2\ell+1}$ implies a homomorphism $\varphi' : G \to C_{2k+1}$ for every $k \in [\ell] = \{1, ..., \ell\}$, where C_r is the cycle with r vertices. In particular, a graph G is 3-colorable if there exists a homomorphism $\varphi : G \to C_{2\ell+1}$ for some integer $\ell \geq 1$ (as this implies a homomorphism $\varphi' : G \to C_3$). The opposite direction is not always true. For example, the graph $G = C_3$ is 3-colorable but is not homomorphic to any $C_{2\ell+1}$ for $\ell \geq 2$. Thus, by considering homomorphisms from a graph G to $C_{2\ell+1}$, we can measure how "strong" the property of 3-colorability is in a given graph G.

Here we will consider this notion in the random graph model $G(n,p)$ (see, e.g., Chapter 7 of [27] for a detailed overview of coloring properties of random graphs). In the case of random graphs, it is known that for $p = \frac{c}{n}$ where $c > 1$ we have that w.h.p. $G \sim G(n,p)$ is not 2-colorable, that is, w.h.p. $\chi(G) \geq 3$ (see, e.g., [8, 27]). In their paper [22], Frieze and Pegden proved the following.

Theorem 1.2. *For any $\ell > 1$, there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that with high probability, $G \sim G(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n})$ either has odd-girth $< 2\ell + 1$ or has a homomorphism to $C_{2\ell+1}$ (the cycle of length $2\ell + 1$).*

In Theorem 1.2 the size of the cycle, $2\ell + 1$, is fixed, and ε (and thus the edge probability p) depends on ℓ. It is also natural to ask, for a fixed probability, about the values of ℓ for which there is a homomorphism from the random graph to $C_{2\ell+1}$. Frieze and Pegden conjectured that the following is true.

Conjecture 1.3 (Conjecture 1 in [22])**.** *For any $c > 1$, there is an ℓ_c such that with high probability, there is no homomorphism from $G \sim G(n, \frac{c}{n})$ to $C_{2\ell+1}$ for any $\ell \geq \ell_c$.*

In Section 4 we give a proof of this conjecture using Theorem 1.1. We show the following.

Theorem 1.4. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an ℓ_ε such that with high probability, there is no homomorphism from $G \sim G(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n})$ to $C_{2\ell+1}$ for any $\ell \geq \ell_\varepsilon$. In fact, $\ell_\varepsilon = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^3}\right)$.*

The second application of Theorem 1.1 is related to colorability of biased random tournaments. Let us look at the following random tournament model. We start with K_n and order its vertices in the natural order $(1, 2, 3, \ldots, n)$. A *p-random tournament* on n vertices, $T \sim T(n, p)$, is a tournament for which $\overrightarrow{ji} \in E(T)$ with probability p and $\overrightarrow{ij} \in E(T)$ with probability $1 - p$, for every $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ independently. Observe trivially that for $p = o(1)$ most of the edges of $T \sim T(n, p)$ typically point forward, explaining our terminology of a biased random tournament. In some cases, it is more natural to view this model as a perturbation of the transitive tournament: we start with the transitive tournament on $[n]$ and then choose each oriented edge with probability $2p$ and re-orient it uniformly at random. We refer the reader to [29] for more details regarding this model and other related models.

We say that a tournament is k-colorable if there exists a coloring $f : [n] \to [k]$ of its vertex set $V = [n]$ such that for every $i \in [k]$ the sub-tournament induced by the vertices with color i is transitive. The *chromatic number* of a tournament T, denoted by $\chi(T)$, is the minimal k for which T is k-colorable. In the past few years there has been extensive research into the chromatic number of tournaments and related concepts. Much of the work dealt with the chromatic number of tournaments with some forbidden substructure. Most notably, Berger et al. characterized the tournaments that are *heroes* (see [6]). A tournament H is called a hero if there exists $C > 0$ such that every H-free tournament G satisfies $\chi(G) \leq C$. See [9] for some more results of this nature.

In this paper we will show that the coloring properties of p-random tournaments are similar to those of the random graph model $G(n, p)$. In the case of random graphs, it is known that for $k \geq 3$ we have a sharp threshold for $G \sim G(n, p)$ being k-colorable. In particular, it is known that for $c > 0$, $G \sim G(n, \frac{c}{n})$ satisfies w.h.p. $\chi(G) \in \{k, k+1\}$, where k is the smallest integer such that $c < 2k \log k$ (see [1, 2, 30]). However, in the case of 2-colorability we observe an entirely different phenomenon (see, e.g., Chapter 5 in [8]). For $c \in (0, 1]$, one can see that a graph $G \sim G(n, \frac{c}{n})$ contains an odd cycle with probability bounded away from zero (as a function of c), and therefore $\chi(G) > 2$ with probability bounded away from zero. On the other hand, G is acyclic with probability bounded away from zero (as a function of c), and thus $\chi(G) \leq 2$ with probability bounded away from zero. Recall that if $c > 1$, then for $p = \frac{c}{n}$ and $G \sim G(n, p)$ w.h.p. $\chi(G) > 2$. We show that in the case of p-random tournaments the behavior is similar.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let $T \sim T(n, \frac{1-\varepsilon}{n})$. Then for large enough n we have that $c_\varepsilon \leq \Pr[\chi(T) \leq 2] \leq 1 - c'_\varepsilon$, where $c_\varepsilon, c'_\varepsilon > 0$ are constants depending on ε.*

Theorem 1.6. *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let $T \sim T(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n})$. Then w.h.p. $\chi(T) > 2$.*

We actually prove something stronger. We show that one needs to reverse a linear number of edges of a typical $T \sim T(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n})$ for it to become bipartite (2-colorable). The *distance of T from bipartiteness*, denoted by $\mathrm{Dist}_{\text{Tour-BP}}(T)$, is the minimal number of edges that need to be reversed to make T bipartite.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a small enough constant and let $T \sim T\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$. Then w.h.p. $Dist_{\text{Tour-BP}}(T) \geq \eta n$, where $\eta = \Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^3}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$.*

Clearly Theorem 1.7 implies Theorem 1.6.

In the next theorem we determine the order of magnitude of the threshold for k-colorability for every $k \geq 3$.

Theorem 1.8. *For every $k \geq 3$, there exist constants $c := c(k)$ and $C := C(k)$ such that if $p \geq \frac{C(k)}{n}$, then for $T \sim T(n,p)$ w.h.p. $\chi(T) > k$, and if $p \leq \frac{c(k)}{n}$ then for $T \sim T(n,p)$ w.h.p. $\chi(T) \leq k$. In fact, $c(k), C(k) = \Theta(k \log k)$.*

Remark 1.9. *Note that for $T \sim T(n,p)$ where $p = o(\frac{1}{n})$ w.h.p. $\chi(T) \leq 2$. This will be argued later in the paper.*

1.1 Notation and terminology

Our graph-theoretic notation is standard and follows that of [34]. In particular we use the following:

For a graph G, let $V = V(G)$ and $E = E(G)$ denote its set of vertices and edges, respectively. We let $v(G) = |V|$ and $e(G) = |E|$. For a subset $U \subseteq V$ we denote by $E_G(U)$ all the edges $e \in E$ with both endpoints in U. For subsets $U, W \subseteq V$ we denote by $E_G(U,W)$ all the edges $e \in E$ with both endpoints in $U \cup W$ for which $e \cap U \neq \emptyset$ and $e \cap W \neq \emptyset$. We simply write $E(U)$ or $E(U,W)$ in the cases where there is no risk of confusion. We also write $e_G(U) = |E_G(U)|$ and $e_G(U,W) = |E_G(U,W)|$.

We assume that n is large enough where needed. We say that an event holds *with high probability* (w.h.p.) if its probability tends to one as n tends to infinity. For the sake of simplicity and clarity of presentation, and in order to shorten some of the proofs, no real effort is made to optimize the constants appearing in our results. We also sometimes omit floor and ceiling signs whenever these are not crucial.

A tournament T on $[n]$ is an orientation of the complete graph K_n. That is, $V(T) = [n]$ and for every edge $\{i,j\}$ of K_n either $(i,j) \in E(T)$ or $(j,i) \in E(T)$. We usually write $\overrightarrow{ij}$ to mean $(i,j) \in E(T)$ (the edge $\{i,j\}$ appears with the orientation from i to j). Let $U, W \subseteq V(T)$ be two disjoint subsets of vertices. We write $U \to W$ to mean that for every $u \in U$ and for every $w \in W$, $\overrightarrow{uw} \in E(T)$. In the case that $U = \{u\}$ or $W = \{w\}$ we simply write $u \to W$ or $U \to w$, respectively (in the case that both $U = \{u\}$ and $W = \{w\}$, we sometimes write $u \to w$ to mean $\overrightarrow{uw} \in E(T)$).

For a tournament T with $V(T) = [n]$ we let $B = B(T)$ be the oriented graph obtained from T by keeping only "backwards" edges, that is $V(B) = [n]$ and $E(B) = \{\overrightarrow{ji} \mid i < j \text{ and } \overrightarrow{ji} \in E(T)\}$. Let R be the graph obtained from B by forgetting the orientation of the edges. R is called the *backedge graph* of T.

For a tournament T and two sets $X, Y \subset V(T)$ we write $E_T(X,Y) = \{\overrightarrow{xy} \in E(T) : x \in X, y \in Y\}$. Also let $e_T(X,Y) = |E_T(X,Y)|$ and $e_T(X) = |E_T(X,X)|$.

For an ordered set of vertices $V = [n]$, we say that $I \subseteq [n]$ is an *interval* if there exist $i, j \in [n]$ such that $k \in I$ if and only if $i \leq k \leq j$ (that is, $I = \{i, i+1, \ldots, j\}$). For an interval $I = \{i, i+1, \ldots, j-1, j\}$, we denote $I^- = \{i, i+1, \ldots, j-1\}$. We define the *length* of I to be $|I| = j - i + 1$.

2 Tools

2.1 Binomial distribution bounds

We use extensively the following standard bound on the lower and the upper tails of the Binomial distribution due to Chernoff (see, e.g., [3], [27]):

Lemma 2.1. *Let $X \sim Bin(n,p)$ and $\mu = \mathbb{E}(X)$, then*

1. $\Pr\left(X < (1-a)\mu\right) < \exp\left(-\frac{a^2\mu}{2}\right)$ *for every* $a > 0$.
2. $\Pr\left(X > (1+a)\mu\right) < \exp\left(-\frac{a^2\mu}{3}\right)$ *for every* $0 < a < 1$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $X \sim Bin(n,p)$ and let $k > 10\mathbb{E}(X)$, then $\Pr(X \geq k) \leq e^{-k}$.*

We will also use the following Chernoff-type bound due to Hoeffding (see, e.g., [3]):

Lemma 2.3. *Let $X \sim Bin(n,p)$ and $\mu = \mathbb{E}(X)$, then*

$$\Pr\left(|X-\mu| > tn\right) < 2\exp\left(-2t^2 n\right).$$

2.2 The structure of the giant component in random graphs

For the proof of Theorem 1.1 we will use a theorem by Ding, Lubetzky and Peres. First we need the following definition.

Definition 2.4. *Let $G = (V,E)$ be a graph. The 2-core of G is the maximal induced subgraph of G with minimum degree at least two.*

Theorem 2.5 (Theorem 1 in [15])**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the 2-core of the largest component of $G(n,p)$ for $p = \frac{\lambda}{n}$, where $\lambda = 1+\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ is fixed. Let $\mu < 1$ be such that $\mu e^{-\mu} = \lambda e^{-\lambda}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be the following model:*

1. *Let Λ be Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(\lambda - \mu, 1/n)$ and let $D_u \sim Poisson(\Lambda)$ for $u \in [n]$ be i.i.d., conditioned on the event that $\sum_{u=1}^{n} D_u 1_{D_u \geq 3}$ is even. Let $N_k = \#\{u : D_u = k\}$ and $N = \sum_{k\geq 3} N_k$. Select a random multigraph $\mathcal{K}$ on N vertices, uniformly among all multigraphs (possibly with loops) that have N_k vertices of degree k for every $k \geq 3$.*
2. *Replace the edges of $\mathcal{K}$ by internally disjoint paths of i.i.d $Geom(1-\mu)$ lengths.*

Then $\mathcal{C}$ is contiguous to the model $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, that is, if $\Pr[\tilde{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathcal{A}] \to 0$ then $\Pr[\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{A}] \to 0$ for any set of graphs $\mathcal{A}$.

We will also use the following claims.

Claim 2.6. *Let $\varepsilon, \lambda, \mu, \Lambda$ be as in Theorem 2.5. Then w.h.p. we have $\varepsilon \leq \Lambda \leq 3\varepsilon$.*

Proof. Since $\lambda = 1+\varepsilon$ and $\mu < 1$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda] = \lambda - \mu > \varepsilon$. By Chebyshev's inequality

$$\Pr\left[\Lambda < \varepsilon\right] = \Pr\left[\Lambda < \mathbb{E}[\Lambda] - (\mathbb{E}[\Lambda] - \varepsilon)\right] \leq \frac{\mathrm{Var}[\Lambda]}{(\lambda - \mu - \varepsilon)^2} = \frac{1}{n(1-\mu)^2} = o(1).$$

Moreover, since μ is such that $\mu e^{-\mu} = \lambda e^{-\lambda}$, we have that $1 - \mu < 2\varepsilon$. Therefore $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda] = \lambda - \mu = \varepsilon + 1 - \mu < 3\varepsilon$. By Chebyshev's inequality we have

$$\Pr[\Lambda > 3\varepsilon] = \Pr[\Lambda - \mathbb{E}[\Lambda] > 3\varepsilon - \mathbb{E}[\Lambda]] \leq \frac{\mathrm{Var}[\Lambda]}{(\lambda - \mu - 3\varepsilon)^2} = \frac{1}{n(\lambda - \mu - 3\varepsilon)^2} = o(1)$$

□

Claim 2.7. *For N, ε and n as in Theorem 2.5 we have that w.h.p. $N = \Theta(\varepsilon^3)n$.*

Proof. We condition on the value of Λ and assume that $\varepsilon \leq \Lambda \leq 3\varepsilon$, which occurs w.h.p. by Claim 2.6. We define the following probabilities: For $X \sim \mathrm{Poisson}(\Lambda)$, let

$$q_{\leq 2} = \Pr[X \leq 2], \quad q_{\geq 3} = \Pr[X \geq 3], \quad q_{\geq 3,\mathrm{even}} = \Pr[X \geq 3, \mathrm{even}], \quad q_{\geq 3,\mathrm{odd}} = \Pr[X \geq 3, \mathrm{odd}]$$

Recall that $N = \sum_{u=1}^{n} 1_{D_u \geq 3}$, where $D_1, ..., D_n$ are i.i.d random variables with the distribution $\mathrm{Poisson}(\Lambda)$. Let A_n be the event that $\sum_{u=1}^{n} D_u 1_{D_u \geq 3}$ is even. In order to prove the claim we need to show that $\Pr\left[N \notin \Theta(\varepsilon^3)n \mid A_n\right] = o(1)$. We will show that $\Pr[N \notin \Theta(\varepsilon^3)n] = o(1)$ and that $\Pr[A_n] = \Theta(1)$. This would imply that

$$\Pr\left[N \notin \Theta(\varepsilon^3)n \mid A_n\right] \leq \frac{\Pr\left[N \notin \Theta(\varepsilon^3)n\right]}{\Pr[A_n]} = o(1).$$

Observe that $N \sim \mathrm{Bin}(n, q_{\geq 3})$. By the definition of the Poisson distribution we have

$$q_{\geq 3} = 1 - e^{-\Lambda} - e^{-\Lambda}\Lambda - e^{-\Lambda}\frac{\Lambda^2}{2} = e^{-\Lambda} \cdot \left(e^{\Lambda} - 1 - \Lambda - \frac{\Lambda^2}{2}\right) = e^{-\Lambda} \cdot \Theta(\Lambda^3) = \Theta(\varepsilon^3),$$

since we conditioned on $\varepsilon \leq \Lambda \leq 3\varepsilon$. By the Chernoff bound we get that $\Pr\left[N \notin \Theta(\varepsilon^3)n\right] = o(1)$.

It remains to show that $p_n := \Pr[A_n] = \Theta(1)$. By conditioning on the value of D_1 we get the following recursive formula for p_n.

$$p_n = q_{\geq 3,\mathrm{even}} \cdot p_{n-1} + q_{\geq 3,\mathrm{odd}} \cdot (1 - p_{n-1}) + q_{\leq 2} \cdot p_n,$$

where p_{n-1} is defined the same way as p_n, only for $n-1$ i.i.d $\mathrm{Poisson}(\Lambda)$ random variables. Simplifying the recursive formula gives:

$$p_n = (q_{\leq 2} + q_{\geq 3,\mathrm{even}} - q_{\geq 3,\mathrm{odd}})p_{n-1} + q_{\geq 3,\mathrm{odd}}.$$

This is a recursive formula of the form $p_n = ap_{n-1} + b$. It is easy to see that since $a \neq 1$, the solution is $p_n = (p_1 - \frac{b}{1-a})a^{n-1} + \frac{b}{1-a}$. So $p_n \to \frac{b}{1-a}$ as $n \to \infty$. Also, $b = q_{\geq 3,\mathrm{odd}} \neq 0$. Therefore $p_n = \Theta(1)$. □

The following claim shows that w.h.p. the number of edges in $\mathcal{K}$ that touch vertices of degree at least 4 is at most $O(\varepsilon^4)n$.

Claim 2.8. *Let $\varepsilon \in \left(0, \frac{1}{3}\right)$ and $\lambda, \mu, \mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ be as in Theorem 2.5. Let $D_u \sim$ Poisson(Λ) for $u \in [n]$ and Λ as in Theorem 2.5. Then $\Pr\left[\sum_{u=1}^{n} D_u \mathbf{1}_{D_u \geq 4} > C\varepsilon^4 n \mid \sum_{u=1}^{n} D_u \mathbf{1}_{D_u \geq 3} \text{ is even}\right] = o(1)$ (for some absolute constant C).*

Proof. We condition on the value of Λ and assume that $\Lambda \leq 3\varepsilon$, which occurs w.h.p. by Claim 2.6. Put $X_u = D_u \mathbf{1}_{D_u \geq 4}$ and $X = \sum_{u=1}^{n} X_u$. Let A_n be the event that $\sum_{u=1}^{n} D_u \mathbf{1}_{D_u \geq 3}$ is even. We showed in the proof of Claim 2.7 that $\Pr[A_n] = \Theta(1)$. Therefore, in order for us to show that $\Pr[X > C\varepsilon^4 n \mid A_n] = o(1)$, it is enough to show that $\Pr[X > C\varepsilon^4 n] = o(1)$.

$$\mathbb{E}[X_u] = e^{-\Lambda} \sum_{k=4}^{\infty} k \cdot \frac{\Lambda^k}{k!} \leq e^{-\Lambda} \Lambda^4 \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \leq C' \varepsilon^4,$$

for some absolute constant C'. So $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq C' \varepsilon^t n$. By the independence of $X_1, ..., X_n$ we have $\mathrm{Var}[X] = \sum_{u=1}^{n} \mathrm{Var}[X_u] = O(n)$. Setting $C = 2C'$ and applying Chebyshev's inequality gives

$$\Pr[X > C\varepsilon^4 n] \leq \Pr[X > 2\mathbb{E}[X]] \leq \frac{\mathrm{Var}[X]}{\mathbb{E}[X]^2} = \frac{O(n)}{\Theta(n^2)} = o(1).$$

□

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

To prove Theorem 1.1 we need to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a multigraph satisfying $e(\mathcal{K}) \geq \frac{3}{2} v(\mathcal{K})$ and let $0.99 \leq \mu < 1$. Replace the edges of $\mathcal{K}$ by paths of i.i.d. Geom$(1-\mu)$ lengths and denote this new (multi)graph by $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. Then w.h.p. we have Dist$_{BP}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \geq \Theta(v(\mathcal{K}))$.*

Proof. Denote by ℓ_e the length of the path that replaces the edge $e \in E(\mathcal{K})$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, and by P_e the set of edges of this path. Note that

$$p_{odd} := \Pr(\ell_e \text{ is odd}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Pr(\ell_e = k,\ k \text{ is odd}) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{odd}} \mu^k (1-\mu) = \frac{1-\mu}{1-\mu^2} < 0.51.$$

The last inequality holds by our assumption that $\mu \geq 0.99$. Also,

$$p_{even} := \Pr(\ell_e \text{ is even}) = 1 - \Pr(\ell_e \text{ is odd}) = 1 - \frac{1-\mu}{1-\mu^2} < \frac{1}{2} < 0.51.$$

We infer that $p_{odd}, p_{even} \in (0.49, 0.51)$.

Observe that if $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) < \alpha \cdot v(\mathcal{K})$, then there exists a partition $V(\tilde{C}) = \tilde{V_1} \uplus \tilde{V_2}$ that satisfies $e(\tilde{V_1}) + e(\tilde{V_2}) < \alpha \cdot v(\mathcal{K})$. Consider any vertex partition of $\mathcal{K}$, $V(\mathcal{K}) = V_1 \uplus V_2$. We will bound the probability that $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ has a bipartition $\tilde{V_1} \uplus \tilde{V_2}$ that extends $V_1 \uplus V_2$ (i.e. $V_1 \subseteq \tilde{V_1}$ and $V_2 \subseteq \tilde{V_2}$) such that $e(\tilde{V_1}) + e(\tilde{V_2}) < \alpha \cdot v(\mathcal{K})$. We will then take the union bound over all bipartitions of $\mathcal{K}$. Since every bipartition of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ extends some bipartition of $\mathcal{K}$, the union bound gives a bound on the probability that $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) < \alpha \cdot v(\mathcal{K})$.

Note that if an edge $e \in \mathcal{K}$ lies inside V_1 or inside V_2 and ℓ_e is odd, then at least one of the edges in P_e must lie inside one of the parts of any extension of $V_1 \uplus V_2$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. Also, if an edge $e \in \mathcal{K}$ is in $E(V_1, V_2)$ and ℓ_e is even, then at least one of the edges in P_e must lie inside one of the parts of any extension of $V_1 \uplus V_2$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. We call this kind of paths *bad*.

Now look at a specific partition $V_1 \uplus V_2$ of $\mathcal{K}$. For any extension $\tilde{V_1} \uplus \tilde{V_2}$ of V_1, V_2, the number of edges inside $\tilde{V_1}$ and $\tilde{V_2}$ is at least the number of bad paths created from the edges of $\mathcal{K}$. Let us denote

this number by X. Then X is stochastically dominates the random variable $Y \sim \mathrm{Bin}(e(\mathcal{K}), 0.49)$. Therefore, for $\alpha = 0.009$, by Lemma 2.3 (where $t = 0.481$)

$$\Pr\left[X < \alpha \cdot v(\mathcal{K})\right] \leq \Pr\left[X < \alpha \cdot e(\mathcal{K})\right] \leq \Pr\left[Y < \alpha \cdot e(\mathcal{K})\right] < 2e^{-2(0.481)^2 e(\mathcal{K})} < 2e^{-0.694 v(\mathcal{K})}.$$

In the last inequality above we used the assumption that $e(\mathcal{K}) \geq \frac{3}{2}v(\mathcal{K})$. By the union bound over all partitions $V_1 \uplus V_2$ of $\mathcal{K}$ we get: the probability that there exists a partition $\tilde{V}_1 \uplus \tilde{V}_2$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ such that there are less than $0.009v(\mathcal{K})$ edges inside $E(\tilde{V}_1) \cup E(\tilde{V}_2)$ is at most

$$2^{v(\mathcal{K})} \cdot 2e^{-0.694 v(\mathcal{K})} = 2e^{(\log 2 - 0.694) v(\mathcal{K})} = o(1).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We will show that w.h.p. the distance of $G \sim G\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$ from bipartiteness is at least δn for $\delta = \Theta(\varepsilon^3)$. This would imply the theorem as w.h.p. we have $e(G) \leq \frac{1+\varepsilon}{2}n + o(n) \leq n$. We can assume that $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ for some small constant ε_0 (this assumption is needed to apply Lemma 3.1). Indeed, if for $G \sim G\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon_0}{n}\right)$ we have w.h.p. $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}(G) \geq c\varepsilon_0^3 n$ (where c is a constant), then by monotonicity, for every $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0$ and $G \sim G\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$ we have w.h.p. $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}(G) \geq c\varepsilon_0^3 n \geq c'\varepsilon^3 n$ (where $c' = c\varepsilon_0^3$). Therefore it is enough to prove Theorem 1.1 for the case that $G \sim G(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n})$ and ε is small enough. We will show that w.h.p. we have $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) \geq \delta n$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is from Theorem 2.5. This would imply, by Theorem 2.5, that w.h.p. the distance of the 2-core of $G\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$ from bipartiteness is at least δn, finishing the proof. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the multigraph generated in item 1 of Theorem 2.5. By Claim 2.7 w.h.p. $\mathcal{K}$ has at least $\Theta(\varepsilon^3)n$ vertices. We condition on this event. Since the degree of every vertex in $\mathcal{K}$ is at least 3, we get that $e(\mathcal{K}) \geq \frac{3}{2}v(\mathcal{K})$. Our assertion now follows from combining Lemma 3.1 and the inequality $v(\mathcal{K}) \geq \Theta(\varepsilon^3)n$. □

Corollary 3.2. *Let ε be small enough, and let $G \sim G(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n})$. Then w.h.p. for every 2-coloring of the vertices of G, there is a collection of $\Theta(\varepsilon^3)n$ pairwise vertex-disjoint monochromatic edges.*

Proof sketch. Theorem 1.1 guarantees that in every 2-coloring of a typical $G \sim G\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$ there are at least $\Theta(\varepsilon^3)n$ monochromatic edges. In fact, the proof finds $\Theta(\varepsilon^3)n$ monochromatic edges, each lying on a path which connects two vertices of the kernel of the giant component of G. By Claim 2.8, the number of edges in the kernel that have an endpoint of kernel-degree greater than 3 is $O(\varepsilon^4)n$. Ignoring these "bad" edges, we still have $\Theta(\varepsilon^3)n$ monochromatic edges with both endpoints of degree at most 3 in the 2-core. Each such edge intersects at most 6 other such edges, so there is a collection of $\Theta(\varepsilon^3)n$ pairwise vertex-disjoint monochromatic edges. □

Remark 3.3. Using a similar technique, we can obtain an analogue of Theorem 1.1 for random graphs in the supercritical phase, i.e. $p = \frac{1+\mu}{n}$ for $n^{-1/3} \ll \mu \ll 1$. Instead of using Theorem 2.5, we need to use an analogous result that describes the structure of the giant component of random graphs in the supercritical phase, see [14]. In this manner we can prove that for μ as above, a typical $G \sim G\left(n, \frac{1+\mu}{n}\right)$ satisfies $\mathrm{Dist}_{\mathrm{BP}}(G) = \Theta(\mu^3)$. This has already been shown (using a different proof technique) in [12].

Remark 3.4. We note that there is a simple deterministic polynomial-time algorithm that w.h.p. finds in $G \sim G(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n})$ a cut of size $\left(1 - O\left(\varepsilon^3\right)\right)e(G)$. By Theorem 1.1 this cut is w.h.p. optimal up to an error of $O\left(\varepsilon^3\right) \cdot e(G)$. The algorithm starts by finding the connected components of G. It is known that w.h.p. G has a single giant component, and that the expected number of cycles not

contained in the giant component is $O(1)$ (see, e.g., [27]). This means that w.h.p. the number of such cycles is, say, $o(n)$, implying that the small components can be cut by omitting at most $o(n)$ edges. As for the giant component, we restrict ourselves to its 2-core (since edges outside the 2-core are not contained in any cycle, and thus may be added to any cut). We denote the 2-core by $\mathcal{C}$. Finding the 2-core of any graph can be easily done by removing one-by-one vertices of degree at most one, until there are none left. Theorem 2.5 describes the typical structure of $\mathcal{C}$. In particular, w.h.p. $\mathcal{C}$ contains vertices of degree at least 3 (these are the vertices of $\mathcal{K}$). By connectivity, every cycle in $\mathcal{C}$ contains such a vertex. The algorithm runs over all paths in $\mathcal{C}$ in which all internal vertices have degree two, and the endpoints have degree at least three (including "paths" (cycles) in which the two endpoints are same; this corresponds to the fact that the multigraph $\mathcal{K}$ may have loops). The algorithm removes one edge from each such path. The remaining edges form the required cut. Indeed, the remaining graph is a forest (as it contains no cycles), and hence bipartite. The number of edges that we removed is precisely $e(\mathcal{K})$. From Theorem 2.5 we have $e(\mathcal{K}) \leq \sum_u D_u \mathbf{1}_{D_u \geq 3}$. It is not hard to check that $\mathbb{E}\left[D_u \mathbf{1}_{D_u \geq 3}\right] = \Theta(\varepsilon^3)$. So by the Central Limit Theorem, w.h.p. we have $\sum_u D_u \mathbf{1}_{D_u \geq 3} \leq \Theta(\varepsilon^3) n$. In conclusion, the cut produced by the algorithm misses $O\left(\varepsilon^3\right) n = O(\varepsilon^3) e(G)$ edges.

4 A solution for Conjecture 1.3

Now we can deduce the following easily for $\ell_\varepsilon = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^3}\right)$.

Theorem 4.1 (Conjecture 1 in [22])**.** *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an ℓ_ε such that with high probability, there is no homomorphism from $G(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n})$ to $C_{2\ell+1}$ for any $\ell \geq \ell_\varepsilon$.*

Proof. Observe that if G is homomorphic to $C_{2\ell+1}$ then one can make G bipartite by removing $\frac{e(G)}{2\ell+1}$ edges. Indeed, assume that there exists a homomorphism $\varphi : G \to C_{2\ell+1}$. Let $v_1, \ldots v_{2\ell+1}$ be the vertices of $C_{2\ell+1}$ and let $e_1, \ldots, e_{2\ell+1}$ be the edges of $C_{2\ell+1}$ such that $e_i = \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ for every $i \in [2\ell]$ and $e_{2\ell+1} = \{v_{2\ell+1}, v_1\}$. Since every edge of G maps into one of the e_i-s, there exists a set F of at most $\frac{e(G)}{2\ell+1}$ edges of G, and there exists i_0 such that the edges that φ maps to e_{i_0} are the edges of F. Now if we erase the edges of F from G, the homomorphism φ is now a homomorphism from $G' = G \setminus F$ to a path of length 2ℓ, so G' is 2-colorable and therefore bipartite. Thus G is $\frac{1}{2\ell+1}$-close to being bipartite.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon)$ be as defined in Theorem 1.1, and let $\ell_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2\delta}$. Let $G \sim G(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n})$, by Theorem 1.1, w.h.p. G is δ-far from being bipartite. Since $\ell \geq \frac{1}{2\delta}$ we have $\frac{1}{2\ell+1} < \frac{1}{2\ell} \leq \delta$, so w.h.p. G is $\frac{1}{2\ell}$-far from being bipartite and thus there is no homomorphism $\varphi : G \to C_{2\ell+1}$ for any $\ell \geq \ell_\varepsilon$. This completes the proof. □

5 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Let $T \sim T\left(n, \frac{1-\varepsilon}{n}\right)$. For the lower bound, we use the following result about $G(n,p)$: For $p = \frac{1-\varepsilon}{n}$ we have $\Pr\left[\chi\big(G(n,p)\big) \leq 2\right] \geq c_\varepsilon > 0$ (see, e.g., [1, 8]). Recall that the *backedge graph* of T is the graph R on the vertices $[n]$ in which $ij \in E(R)$ if and only if $i < j$ and $j \to i$ in T. It is not hard to see that if R is k-colorable then so is T. Indeed, an independent set in R spans a transitive subtournament in T, since all the edges in it go in the same direction (forward). Moreover, $R \sim G\left(n, \frac{1-\varepsilon}{n}\right)$. So $\Pr[\chi(T) \leq 2] \geq \Pr[\chi(R) \leq 2] \geq c_\varepsilon$.

Using the backedge graph of $T \sim T(n,p)$ we can also explain Remark 1.9. Indeed, for $p = o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$, $R \sim G(n,p)$ and therefore w.h.p. R does not contain any odd cycle (or any cycle at all), so R is w.h.p. 2-colorable, and so is T.

We now prove the upper bound in the theorem. Our strategy is to show that with probability at least c'_ε (for c'_ε to be determined later) $T \sim T\left(n, \frac{1-\varepsilon}{n}\right)$ contains a small non-2-colorable subtournament. Let H be the tournament on the vertices $x_1, ..., x_7$ with following edges:
$x_1 \to x_2 \to x_3 \to x_1$, $x_4 \to x_5 \to x_6 \to x_4$, $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\} \to \{x_4, x_5, x_6\} \to x_7 \to \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$. It is not hard to check that H is not 2-colorable. Let $j_1, ..., j_7 \in [n]$ such that $j_1 < ... < j_7$. We say that $(j_1, ..., j_7)$ is an *ordered copy* of H in T if the map $x_i \to j_i$ is an embedding of H into T. If T contains an ordered copy of H then T is not 2-colorable. So let X be the number of ordered copies of H in T. Our goal from now on is to show that $\Pr[X = 0] \leq 1 - c'_\varepsilon < 1$. We use the Paley-Zygmund inequality that states that

$$\Pr\left[X > \theta \mathbb{E}[X]\right] \geq (1-\theta)^2 \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]^2}{\mathbb{E}[X^2]}$$

for every $\theta \in [0,1]$. Setting $\theta = 0$ gives

$$\Pr[X > 0] \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]^2}{\mathbb{E}[X^2]}. \tag{1}$$

For a 7-tuple $J = (j_1, ..., j_7)$, let I_J be the indicator of the event that $(j_1, ..., j_7)$ is an ordered copy of H. It is easy to see that H has 5 backedges in the order $x_1, ..., x_7$. Therefore we have $\Pr[I_J = 1] = p^5(1-p)^{\binom{7}{2}-5} = p^5(1-p)^{16}$, where $p = \frac{1-\varepsilon}{n}$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \binom{n}{7} p^5 (1-p)^{16} = \left(1 - o(1)\right)\binom{n}{7} p^5. \tag{2}$$

We now estimate $\mathbb{E}[X^2]$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[X^2] = \sum_{J_1, J_2} \mathbb{E}\left[I_{J_1} I_{J_2}\right].$$

where the sum goes over all (ordered) pairs of 7-tuples. Fix two 7-tuples J_1 and J_2. Put $k = |J_1 \cap J_2|$. Clearly $0 \leq k \leq 7$. Observe that there is at most one way to orient the edges inside $J_1 \cup J_2$ so that both J_1 and J_2 would be ordered copies of H. Let ℓ be the number of backedges inside $J_1 \cap J_2$ in this orientation (if it exists). It is not hard to check that every subset of k vertices of H contains at most k backedges in the ordering $x_1, ..., x_7$. Therefore $\ell \leq k$. The probability that both J_1 and J_2 are ordered copies of H is

$$p^5(1-p)^{16} p^{5-\ell}(1-p)^{16-\left(\binom{k}{2}-\ell\right)} \leq p^{10-\ell} \leq p^{10-k}.$$

The number of pairs of 7-tuples J_1, J_2 that have k vertices in common is

$$\binom{n}{7}\binom{7}{k}\binom{n-7}{7-k}.$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[X^2] \leq \sum_{k=0}^{7} \binom{n}{7}\binom{7}{k}\binom{n-7}{7-k} p^{10-k}. \tag{3}$$

Plugging (2) and (3) into (1) gives:

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr[X>0] &\geq \frac{\left(1-o(1)\right)\binom{n}{7}^2 p^{10}}{\sum_{k=0}^{7}\binom{n}{7}\binom{7}{k}\binom{n-7}{7-k}p^{10-k}} = \frac{\left(1-o(1)\right)\frac{n^7}{7!}}{\sum_{k=0}^{7}\binom{7}{k}\frac{n^{7-k}}{(7-k)!}p^{-k}} \\ &\geq \frac{1-o(1)}{(7!)^2\sum_{k=0}^{7}n^{-k}p^{-k}} = \frac{1-o(1)}{(7!)^2\sum_{k=0}^{7}(1-\varepsilon)^{-k}} \\ &\geq \frac{\left(1-o(1)\right)(1-\varepsilon)^7}{8\cdot(7!)^2} > \frac{(1-\varepsilon)^7}{16\cdot(7!)^2}.\end{aligned}$$

We may set, say, $c'_\varepsilon = \frac{(1-\varepsilon)^7}{16\cdot(7!)^2}$, and then the assertion of the theorem holds.

6 Proof of Theorem 1.7

In order to prove Theorem 1.7 we need some auxiliary claims about random graphs and tournaments. The following is a simple fact about the maximal degree in $G(n,p)$ where $p=\Theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$.

Claim 6.1. *Let $G\sim G(n,p)$ where $p=\frac{c}{n}$ ($c>0$ is a constant). Then w.h.p. the maximal degree in G is $O(\log n)$.*

Proof. For every $v\in V(G)$, let $d(v)$ be the degree. Since $d(v)\sim \mathrm{Bin}(n-1,p)$ we have by Lemma 2.2

$$\Pr(d(v)\geq 5\log n)\leq e^{-5\log n}.$$

Then by the union bound, we have that for every vertex $v\in V(G)$,

$$\Pr(d(v)\geq 5\log n)\leq n\cdot e^{-5\log n} = o\left(1\right).$$

□

Recall that the p-random tournament $T(n,p)$ is on the (ordered) vertex set $[n]$, and for every $1\leq i<j\leq n$, $\overrightarrow{ji}\in E(T)$ independently with probability p. For a tournament T, recall that $B=B(T)$ is the oriented graph obtained from T by keeping only backward edges, that is, $V(B)=[n]$ and $E(B)=\{\overrightarrow{ji}\mid i<j \text{ and } \overrightarrow{ji}\in E(T)\}$. Let $\alpha>0$ be fixed. We say that an edge $\overrightarrow{ji}\in E(B)$ is *α-long* if $j-i\geq\alpha n$, otherwise we say that the edge is *α-short*. Denote the set of α-short edges in B by $B_{\alpha\text{-}short}$ and the set of α-long edges by $B_{\alpha\text{-}long}$. For an interval $I\subseteq[n]$, let $B^I_{\alpha\text{-}short}$ (respectively, $B^I_{\alpha\text{-}long}$) be the set of edges $e\in B_{\alpha\text{-}short}$ (respectively, $e\in B_{\alpha\text{-}long}$) with both endpoints in I. Throughout this section we assume that ε is small enough.

Claim 6.2. *Let $T\sim T\left(n,\frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$. Let $\alpha\in(0,1)$ be a constant. Then w.h.p. $|B_{\alpha\text{-}short}|\leq 2\alpha(1+\varepsilon)n$.*

Proof. The total number of pairs $\{i,j\}$ such that $i<j\leq i+\alpha n$ is at most αn^2. Since every edge appears independently and with probability $p=\frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}$, the number of α-short backedges is stochastically dominated by a random variable distributed binomially with parameters $\left(\alpha n^2,\frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$. By Chernoff's inequality (see Lemma 2.1) we have that

$$\Pr\left[\,|B_{\alpha\text{-}short}|>2\alpha(1+\varepsilon)n\right]\leq \Pr\left[\mathrm{Bin}\left(\alpha n^2,\frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)>2\alpha(1+\varepsilon)n\right]\leq e^{-\frac{1}{3}\alpha(1+\varepsilon)n},$$

as required. □

Claim 6.3. *Let $T \sim T\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$. Let $\beta_0 \in (0,1)$ be a constant. Then the following holds simultaneously for all intervals $I \subseteq [n]$ of length at least $\beta_0 n$. Put $\beta = \frac{|I|}{n}$ and $\alpha = \frac{\beta}{6}$, then:*

1. *There is a collection $S \subseteq B^I_{\alpha\text{-long}}$, $|S| \geq c\beta^2 n$, of pairwise vertex-disjoint edges (where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant).*
2. *$\#\left\{\overrightarrow{ji} \in B : i \in I \text{ and } \frac{\beta}{2}n \leq j - i + 1 \leq 2\beta n\right\} \leq 8\beta^2 n$.*

Proof. Put $p = \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}$. Let I be an interval of length $\beta n \geq \beta_0 n$. Put $\alpha = \frac{\beta}{6}$. Every vertex i in I participates in at most αn pairs $\{i,j\}$ with $i < j \leq i + \alpha n$. So the total number of possible α-short edges in I is bounded from above by $\alpha n|I| = \alpha\beta n^2$. By our choice of α we get: The number of possible long-edges inside I is at least $\binom{\beta n}{2} - \frac{\beta^2}{6}n^2 \geq \frac{\beta^2}{6}n^2$. Let m_I be the size of the largest collection of vertex-disjoint α-long backedges inside I. Fix any $t \leq c\beta^2 n$ (we choose c later). We will bound the probability that $m_I = t$. Observe that if $m_I = t$, then there is a collection $e_1, ..., e_t$ of α-long pairwise vertex-disjoint edges, such that every other α-long edge intersects one of the e_i's. For fixed $e_1, ..., e_t$, there are at least $\beta^2 n^2/6 - 2t \cdot n$ possible α-long edges that do not intersect any of the e_i's. Indeed, every vertex in $\bigcup_{i=1}^t e_i$ participates in at most n possible edges; therefore there are at most $2t \cdot n$ α-long edges that interesect one of the e_i's. Hence, the probability that such a collection $e_1, ..., e_t$ exists is at most

$$\binom{\binom{|I|}{2}}{t} p^t (1-p)^{\beta^2 n^2/6 - 2t\cdot n} \leq \left(\frac{e\beta^2 n^2 p}{t}\right)^t \cdot e^{-\frac{\beta^2 n^2 p}{8}}. \tag{4}$$

It is not hard to check that $\left(\frac{e\beta^2 n^2 p}{t}\right)^t$ is monotone increasing in t if $t \leq c\beta^2 n$ for c sufficiently small, so we may substitute $t = c\beta^2 n$. Therefore (4) is at most

$$\left(\frac{e(1+\varepsilon)}{c}\right)^{c\beta^2 n} \cdot e^{-\frac{\beta^2 n^2 p}{8}} \leq \left(\left(\frac{6}{c}\right)^c e^{-\frac{1}{8}}\right)^{\beta^2 n} = o\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right),$$

if we take c to be small enough so that $\left(\frac{6}{c}\right)^c e^{-\frac{1}{8}} < 1$. Taking the union bound over all intervals I (there are at most n^2 of them), establishes item 1 of the claim.

We now prove Item 2. Let I be an interval of length βn. Every $i \in I$ participates in at most $3\beta n$ pairs $\{i,j\}$ such that $\frac{\beta}{2}n \leq j - i + 1 \leq 2\beta n$. So the total number of possible edges $\overrightarrow{ji}$ for which $i \in I$ and $\frac{\beta}{2}n \leq j - i + 1 \leq 2\beta n$ is bounded from above by $3\beta n|I| = 3\beta^2 n^2$. Therefore, the random variable $X_I = \#\left\{\overrightarrow{ji} \in B : i \in I \text{ and } \frac{\beta}{2}n \leq j - i + 1 \leq 2\beta n\right\}$ is stochastically dominated by a random variable distributed binomially with parameters $(3\beta^2 n^2, p)$. By Chernoff's inequality (Lemma 2.1) we have

$$\Pr[X_I > 8\beta^2 n] \leq \Pr\left[X_I > 4\beta^2(1+\varepsilon)n\right] \leq \Pr\left[\mathrm{Bin}\left(3\beta^2 n^2, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right) > 4\beta^2(1+\varepsilon)n\right] \leq e^{-\frac{1}{9}\beta^2(1+\varepsilon)n}$$

Taking the union bound over all intervals establishes Item 2 of the claim. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $T \sim T(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n})$. Let B, B_{short} and B_{long} be defined as in Claim 6.2. Let R be the backedge graph of T (as defined in Section 1.1), that is, the graph obtained from B by forgetting the orientation of the edges. Then $R \sim G\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$. By Corollary 3.2, w.h.p. in every 2-coloring of R there are δn monochromatic pairwise vertex-disjoint edges, where $\delta = \Theta(\varepsilon^3)$.

Fix γ such that $2\gamma(1+\varepsilon) < \frac{\delta}{4}$. We assume from now on that the assertions of Corollary 3.2 and of Claims 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 hold, and show that this implies that $\mathrm{Dist}_{\text{Tour-BP}}(T) \geq \eta n$ (where $\eta := \eta(\varepsilon)$). All these events hold w.h.p. so they also hold simultaneously w.h.p. This will imply that w.h.p. $\mathrm{Dist}_{\text{Tour-BP}}(T) \geq \eta n$. We apply Claim 6.3 with $\beta_0 = \gamma$.

Our goal is to show that for every bipartition $V_1 \uplus V_2$ of T, one must reverse at least ηn edges to make both parts transitive. Let $V_1 \uplus V_2$ be some partition of $V(T) = [n]$. We think of it as a 2-coloring of $[n]$ with colors 1 and 2. By Corollary 3.2, there are δn monochromatic pairwise vertex-disjoint backedges. WLG, at least $\frac{\delta}{2}n$ of these edges are colored with color 1. By Claim 6.2 (for $\alpha = \gamma$) we have that $|B_{\gamma\text{-}short}| \leq 2\gamma(1+\varepsilon)n < \frac{\delta}{4}n$ (where the last inequality follows from our choice of γ). Hence there is a collection L_1 of at least $\frac{\delta}{4}n$ γ-long pairwise vertex-disjoint edges, with both endpoints colored by 1.

Now let L_2 be the set of all edges $\overrightarrow{vu} = e \in L_1$ for which there exists $w \in V(T)$ such that $u < w < v$, $\overrightarrow{uw} \in E(T)$, $\overrightarrow{wv} \in E(T)$, and w is colored with color 1. We consider two complementary cases.

Case I: $|L_2| \geq \frac{1}{2}|L_1|$. By definition, every edge $\overrightarrow{vu} \in L_2$ lies in a monochromatic cyclic triangle, namely the triangle $u \to w \to v \to u$. Denote the set of these triangles by Tr. Then $|Tr| = |L_2|$. Observe that each triangle in Tr shares an edge with at most one other triangle in Tr (this follows from the fact that the edges in L_2 are vertex-disjoint). Therefore, there is a subset $Tr_1 \subseteq Tr$ of size at least $\frac{|Tr|}{2}$ of pairwise edge-disjoint cyclic triangles. By assumption, the vertices of all triangles in Tr_1 are colored with 1. Clearly one needs to reverse one edge from each triangle in Tr_1 to make V_1 (the set of vertices with color 1) transitive. By the edge-disjointness of the triangles, one needs to reverse at least $|Tr_1| \geq \frac{|Tr|}{2} \geq \frac{|L_1|}{4} = \Omega(\varepsilon^3)n$ edges to make V_1 transitive. So $\mathrm{Dist}_{\text{Tour-BP}}(T) \geq \Omega(\varepsilon^3)n$, as required.

Case II: $|L_2| < \frac{1}{2}|L_1|$. For an edge $\overrightarrow{vu} = e \in L_1 \setminus L_2$, let $I_e = [u, v]$ be the interval of the edge e. Set $\ell = \lfloor \log_2(1/\gamma) \rfloor$. Clearly we have $\ell = O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$. We consider the following sequence of intervals: $J_k = \left[2^k\gamma n, 2^{k+1}\gamma n\right)$ for $0 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$ and $J_\ell = \left[2^\ell \gamma n, n\right]$. By the Pigeonhole Principle, there is some $k = 0, ..., \ell$ such that at least $\frac{|L_1 \setminus L_2|}{\ell+1} \geq \frac{|L_1|}{2(\ell+1)}$ of the edges $e \in L_1 \setminus L_2$ satisfy $|I_e| \in J_k$. Let L_3 be the set of these edges. Also put $\rho_- = 2^k\gamma$ and $\rho_+ = 2^{k+1}\gamma$.

Claim 6.4. *There is a collection of $t \geq \Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^3}{\rho_+^2 \log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$ edges $e_1, ..., e_t \in L_3$ such that $I_{e_i} \cap I_{e_j} = \emptyset$ for every $1 \leq i < j \leq t$.*

Claim 6.5. *For every $\overrightarrow{vu} = e \in L_3$ there is a collection $Tr = Tr(e)$ of at least $\Omega(\rho_-^2)n$ pairwise edge-disjoint monochromatic cyclic triangles, all contained in the interval I_e.*

Let us first complete the proof of the theorem based on Claims 6.4 and 6.5, and then proceed to prove these claims. Let $e_1, ..., e_t$ be the collection of edges from Claim 6.4. For every $i = 1, ..., t$, let $Tr(e_i)$ be the collection of cyclic triangles guaranteed by Claim 6.5. Put $Tr = \bigcup_{i=1}^{t} Tr(e_i)$. Then the triangles in Tr are pairwise edge-disjoint and monochromatic (this follows from Claim 6.5 and

the fact that $I_{e_i} \cap I_{e_j} = \emptyset$ for every $1 \leq i < j \leq t$). Moreover,

$$|Tr| \geq t \cdot \Omega(\rho_-^2)n = \Omega\left(\frac{\rho_-^2 \varepsilon^3}{\rho_+^2 \log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)n = \Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^3}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)n$$

The rightmost equality above follows from the fact that $\rho_+ = 2\rho_-$. Clearly one needs to reverse one edge from each triangle in Tr to make V_1 and V_2 (the color classes) transitive. By the edge-disjointness of the triangles, one needs to reverse at least $|Tr|$ edges. So $\text{Dist}_{\text{Tour-BP}}(T) \geq |Tr| = \Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^3}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)n$, as required.

Proof of Claim 6.4. We find $e_1, ..., e_t$ greedily. Let $e_1 = \overrightarrow{v_1 u_1} \in L_3$ be the edge with the leftmost left-end-point among all edges in L_3. Put $\beta = \frac{|I_{e_1}|}{n}$. By the definition of L_3 we have $\beta n \geq \rho_- n \geq \gamma n$, and so we can apply Claim 6.3 to I_{e_1}. By Item 2 in Claim 6.3 we have:

$$\#\left\{\overrightarrow{vu} \in B : u \in I_{e_1} \text{ and } \frac{\beta}{2}n \leq v - u + 1 \leq 2\beta n\right\} \leq 8\beta^2 n \leq 8\rho_+^2 n \tag{5}$$

Observe that for every edge $\overrightarrow{vu} \in L_3$ we have $\frac{\beta}{2}n \leq \rho_- n \leq v - u + 1 \leq \rho_+ n \leq 2\beta n$. So in fact, equation 5 implies that $\#\{e \in L_3 \setminus \{e_1\} : I_e \cap I_{e_1} \neq \emptyset\} \leq 8\rho_+^2 n$. Remove from L_3 every edge e such that $I_e \cap I_{e_1} \neq \emptyset$ (including e_1 itself). Let e_2 be the edge with the leftmost left-end-point among the remaining edges. We continue this process until there are no edges left. Suppose that at the end we have the edges $e_1, ..., e_t$. At each step we removed at most $8\rho_+^2 n + 1$ edges, so $t \geq \frac{|L_3|}{8\rho_+^2 n + 1}$. Recall that $\ell = O\big(\log(1/\varepsilon)\big)$, $|L_3| \geq \frac{|L_1|}{2(\ell+1)}$ and $|L_1| = \Omega(\varepsilon^3)n$. This implies that $t = \Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^3}{\rho_+^2 \log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$, as required. □

Proof of Claim 6.5. Put $\beta = \frac{|I_e|}{n}$ and $\alpha = \frac{\beta}{6}$. By the definition of L_3 we have: $\beta \geq \rho_- \geq \gamma$. By Item 1 in Claim 6.3, there is a collection S_e of size $|S_e| \geq c\beta^2 n$ of α-long pairwise vertex-disjoint edges inside I_e. Recall that by definition, every $w \in I_e$ which satisfies $\overrightarrow{uw}, \overrightarrow{wv} \in E(T)$ is colored with color 2. Let Y be the set of all $w \in I_e$ for which either $\overrightarrow{wu} \in E(T)$ or $\overrightarrow{vw} \in E(T)$. By Claim 6.1, the degrees of u, v in R are at most $5 \log n$, and so $|Y| \leq 10 \log n$. Let B_Y be the set of edges in S_e with at least one endpoint in Y. Since the edges in S_e are vertex disjoint, we get $|B_Y| \leq |Y| \leq 10 \log n$. Therefore $L' = S_e \setminus B_Y$ satisfies $|L'| \geq \frac{1}{2}|S_e| \geq \frac{c}{2}\beta^2 n$.

Let $\overrightarrow{yx} \in L'$. Then x, y are colored with color 2 because $x, y \notin Y$. We claim that there is a vertex $z \in [x, y]$ that is colored with color 2 and satisfies $\overrightarrow{xz} \in E(T)$ and $\overrightarrow{zy} \in E(T)$. To see this, notice that $|[x, y]| \geq \alpha n$ (because $\overrightarrow{yx}$ is α-long). All but at most $|Y| \leq 10 \log n$ of the vertices $z \in I_e$ are colored with color 2. Moreover, the number of vertices $z \in [x, y]$ that satisfy either $\overrightarrow{zx} \in E(T)$ or $\overrightarrow{yz} \in E(T)$ is at most $d_R(x) + d_R(y) \leq 10 \log n$ (by Claim 6.1). So there are at least $\alpha n - 20 \log n \geq 1$ vertices z that satisfy our requirements. Fix one such z and consider the cyclic triangle $x \to z \to y \to x$. Set Tr' to be the collection of all these triangles, one for each edge $\overrightarrow{yx} \in L'$. Observe that each triangle in Tr' shares an edge with at most one other triangle in Tr' (this follows from the fact that the edges in L' are vertex-disjoint). Therefore, there is a subset $Tr(e) \subseteq Tr'$ of size at least $\frac{|Tr'|}{2}$ of pairwise edge-disjoint monochromatic cyclic triangles. Recall that $|Tr'| = |L'|$ and $|L'| \geq \frac{c}{2}\beta^2 n \geq \frac{c}{2}\rho_-^2 n$. This implies that $|Tr(e)| = \Omega(\rho_-^2)n$. □

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

7 Proof of Theorem 1.8

We will use the following fact in the proof of Theorem 1.8.

Lemma 7.1. *[Theorem 2 from [16]] The largest collection of edge-disjoint triangles in K_n is of size at least $\frac{n^2}{6} - \frac{n}{3}$.*

Let $k \geq 3$ and let $C = C(k)$ to be chosen later. Let $T \sim T(n, \frac{C}{n})$. If T is k-corolable, then there exists a transitive sub-tournament of size at least $\frac{n}{k}$. We will show that w.h.p. this is not the case. Let T' be a fixed sub-tournament on $n_0 = \frac{n}{k}$ vertices (keeping the order of the vertices of T). By Lemma 7.1, there is a set of size $\frac{n_0^2}{7}$ of triples of vertices $S = \{\{x_i, y_i, z_i\}\}_{i=1}^{n_0^2/7}$ in T' such that for every $i \neq j$ we have $|\{x_i, y_i, z_i\} \cap \{x_j, y_j, z_j\}| \leq 1$. If T' is transitive, then every triangle from S has to be transitive. Moreover, the probability that a triangle on a vertex set $\{x, y, z\} \in S$ is transitive is $1 - (1-p)^2 p - (1-p)p^2 \leq 1 - \frac{0.9C}{n}$. Therefore,

$$\Pr(T' \text{ is transitive}) \leq \Pr(\text{every triangle in } S \text{ is transitive}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{0.9C}{n}\right)^{|S|}.$$

Now, using the union bound, the probability that there exists a transitive sub-tournament of size n_0 is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
\binom{n}{n_0}\left(1 - \frac{0.9C}{n}\right)^{|S|} &\leq \left(k \cdot e^{-\frac{0.9C}{n}|S|/n_0}\right)^{n/k} \\
&\leq \left(k \cdot e^{-(\frac{0.9C}{n})^2 n_0/7}\right)^{n/k} \\
&= \left(k \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{7}\frac{0.9C}{k}}\right)^{n/k}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we set $C = 8k \log k$ (and thus $p = 8k \log k/n$) we have that the probability that there exists a transitive sub-tournament of size n_0 is $o(1)$ and therefore w.h.p. T is not k-colorable.

For the lower bound, we show that for every $k \geq 3$, there exists a constant $c := c(k)$ such that if $p \leq \frac{c(k)}{n}$, then for $T \sim T(n,p)$ w.h.p. $\chi(T) \leq k$. Indeed, recall that R is the graph on the vertex set $[n]$ where for every $i < j$, $ij \in E(R)$ if and only if $\overrightarrow{ji} \in T$, then $R \sim G(n,p)$. Recall also that if R is k-colorable then T is also k-colorable. Indeed, an independent set in R is transitive in T, since all the edges in it go in the same direction. It is known (see, e.g., [2]) that for every k, if $c(k) < 2(k-1)\log(k-1)$ then for $p \leq \frac{c(k)}{n}$, $R \sim G(n,p)$ is w.h.p. k-corolable, and therefore T is also w.h.p. k-colorable.

8 Concluding Remarks and Open Problems

In this paper we dealt with two seemingly unrelated topics: homomorphisms of sparse random graphs and coloring properties of biased random tournaments. We attacked both problems using an upper bound on the maximum cut in sparse random graphs. We improved on previous known upper bounds and obtained a sharp upper bound for the latter problem. This was made possible by the deep result of Ding, Lubetzky and Peres [15] about the typical structure of the giant component in sparse random graphs.

Using the aforementioned result on MAXCUT, we immediately obtained a solution to a conjecture of Frieze and Pegden. The conjecture stated that w.h.p. the random graph $G \sim G\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$ does not have a homomorphism into a sufficiently large odd cycle. We actually showed for $\ell = \Theta\left(\varepsilon^{-3}\right)$, there is no homomorphism from a typical $G\left(n, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}\right)$ to $C_{2\ell+1}$. It would be interesting to find the minimal $\ell(\varepsilon)$ with this property.

Regarding random tournaments, we investigated the typical chromatic number of $T \sim T(n,p)$ (the biased p-random tournament) for $p = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$. We showed that this chromatic number behaves similarly to the typical chromatic number of $G \sim G(n,p)$ for the same values of p. In particular, if $k \geq 3$, then there is a threshold for k-colorability of order $\frac{k \log k}{n}$ (and it would be nice to find the exact threshold function, i.e. to calculate the "right" multiplicative constant before $k \log k$). On the other hand, there is a coarse threshold for 2-colorability: if $p = \frac{c}{n}$ for $c < 1$, then the probability of being 2-colorable is bounded away from 0 and 1; if $p = \frac{c}{n}$ for $c > 1$ then a typical $T(n,p)$ is not 2-colorable. In fact, we proved something stronger: for $p = \frac{1+\varepsilon}{n}$, a typical $T \sim T\left(n,p\right)$ has linear distance from being 2-colorable. More precisely, we showed that this distance is $\mathrm{Dist}_{\text{Tour-BP}}(T) \geq \Omega\Big(\frac{\varepsilon^3}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}\Big)n$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{Dist}_{\text{Tour-BP}}(T) \leq \mathrm{Dist}_{\text{BP}}(R)$, where R is the backedge graph of T (see Section 1.1). We showed (see Theorem 1.1 and Remark 3.4) that the typical distance of $R \sim G(n,p)$ from bipartiteness is $\Theta(\varepsilon^3)n$. Hence we have the upper bound $\mathrm{Dist}_{\text{Tour-BP}}(T) \leq \Theta(\varepsilon^3)n$. It would be interesting to close the gap between the lower and upper bounds for $\mathrm{Dist}_{\text{Tour-BP}}(T)$.

References

[1] D. Achlioptas, and E. Friedgut. "A sharp threshold for k-colorability." Random Structures and Algorithms 14, no. 1 (1999): 63–70.

[2] D. Achlioptas, and A. Naor. "The two possible values of the chromatic number of a random graph." Annals of Mathematics, 162 (2005): 1333–1349.

[3] N. Alon and J. H. Spencer, **The Probabilistic Method**, 3^{rd} ed. Wiley, New York, 2008.

[4] S. Arora, D. Karger, and M. Karpinski. "Polynomial time approximation schemes for dense instances of NP-hard problems." In Proceedings of the twenty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC '95), pp. 284–293. ACM, 1995.

[5] M. Bayati, D. Gamarnik, and P. Tetali. "Combinatorial approach to the interpolation method and scaling limits in sparse random graphs." Annals of Probability , Vol. 4, No. 61 (2013): 4080–4115.

[6] E. Berger, K. Choromanski, M. Chudnovsky, J. Fox, M. Loebl, A. Scott, P. Seymour and S. Thomassé. "Tournaments and colouring." Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B, 103 (2013): 1–20.

[7] A. Bertoni, P. Campadelli, and R. Posenato. "An upper bound for the maximum cut mean value." In Graph-theoretic concepts in computer science, pp. 78–84. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1997.

[8] B. Bollobás. **Random graphs**, 2^{nd} ed. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[9] K. Choromanski, M. Chudnovsky, and P. Seymour. "Tournaments with near-linear transitive subsets." Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B, 109 (2014): 228–249.

[10] D. Coppersmith, D. Gamarnik, M. Hajiaghayi, and G. B. Sorkin. "Random MAX SAT, random MAX CUT, and their phase transitions." Random Structures and Algorithms 24, no. 4 (2004): 502–545.

[11] A. Coja-Oghlan, C. Moore, and V. Sanwalani. "MAX k-CUT and approximating the chromatic number of random graphs." Random Structures and Algorithms 28, no. 3 (2006): 289–322.

[12] H. Daudé, C. Martínez, V. Rasendrahasina, and V. Ravelomanana. "The MAX-CUT of sparse random graphs." In Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA '12), pp. 265–271. SIAM, 2012.

[13] A. Dembo, A. Montanari, and S. Sen. "Extremal cuts of sparse random graphs." arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.03923 (2015).

[14] J. Ding, J. H. Kim, E. Lubetzky, and Y. Peres. "Anatomy of a young giant component in the random graph." Random Structures and Algorithms 39, no. 2 (2011): 139–178.

[15] J. Ding, E. Lubetzky, and Y. Peres. "Anatomy of the giant component: The strictly supercritical regime." European Journal of Combinatorics 35 (2014): 155–168.

[16] T. Feder, and C. S. Subi. "Packing Edge-Disjoint Triangles in Given Graphs." In Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC), vol. 19, p. 13. 2012.

[17] U. Feige. "Relations between average case complexity and approximation complexity." In Proceedings of the thiry-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC '02), pp. 534–543. ACM, 2002.

[18] U. Feige, and E. Ofek. "Spectral techniques applied to sparse random graphs." Random Structures and Algorithms 27, no. 2 (2005): 251–275.

[19] E. Friedgut, and J. Bourgain. "Sharp thresholds of graph properties, and the k-sat problem." Journal of the American Mathematical Society 12, no. 4 (1999): 1017–1054.

[20] A. Frieze, and M. Jerrum. "Improved approximation algorithms for max k-cut and max bisection." Algorithmica 18, no. 1 (1997): 67–81.

[21] A. Frieze, and R. Kannan. "The regularity lemma and approximation schemes for dense problems." In Proceedings of the 37th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS '96), pp. 12–20. IEEE, 1996.

[22] A. Frieze, and W. Pegden. "Between 2-and 3-colorability." arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.4987 (2014).

[23] D. Gamarnik, and Q. Li. "On the max-cut over sparse random graph." arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.1698 (2014).

[24] M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson, and L. Stockmeyer. "Some simplified NP-complete graph problems." Theoretical Computer Science 1, no. 3 (1976): 237–267.

[25] M. X. Goemans, and D. P. Williamson. "Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming." Journal of the ACM 42, no. 6 (1995): 1115–1145.

[26] J. Håstad. "Some optimal inapproximability results." Journal of the ACM 48, no. 4 (2001): 798–859.

[27] S. Janson, T. Łuczak and A. Rucinski. **Random graphs**. John Wiley & Sons, 2000.

[28] V. Kalapala and C. Moore, MAX-CUT on sparse random graphs, University of New Mexico Technical Report TR-CS-2002-24.

[29] M. Krivelevich, M. Kwan, and B. Sudakov. "Cycles and matchings in randomly perturbed digraphs and hypergraphs." arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.04816 (2015).

[30] T. Łuczak. "A note on the sharp concentration of the chromatic number of random graphs." Combinatorica 11, no. 3 (1991): 295–297.

[31] S. Poljak, and Zs. Tuza. "Maximum cuts and large bipartite subgraphs." DIMACS Series 20 (1995): 181–244.

[32] A. D. Scott, and G. B. Sorkin. "Solving sparse random instances of MAX CUT and MAX 2-CSP in linear expected time." Combinatorics, Probability and Computing 15, no. 1-2 (2006): 281–315.

[33] L. Trevisan, G. B. Sorkin, M. Sudan, and D. P. Williamson. "Gadgets, approximation, and linear programming." SIAM Journal on Computing 29, no. 6 (2000): 2074–2097.

[34] D. B. West, **Introduction to Graph Theory**, 2^{nd} ed. Prentice Hall, 2001.